

H 2940

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 17, 1975

one of the pressing issues pending before the 94th Congress. One of the ways by which Congress can act affirmatively to restore the public's confidence in their Government and their leaders is to pass legislation requiring public disclosure of the personal finances of Government officials and candidates to Federal office.

Congressman ALAN STEELMAN and I have been joined by 118 of our colleagues in cosponsoring H.R. 3249, the Financial Disclosure Act. This bill establishes uniform financial disclosure standards throughout the Government. An annual disclosure report, filed with the Comptroller General and available for public inspection, would be required from the President and Vice President, Members of Congress and all officers and employees of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Federal Government who earn more than \$25,000 a year. Candidates in primaries and in general elections for the Congress and for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency also would be required to present a financial disclosure statement.

The full personal disclosure by Government officials of their personal financial affairs would, I believe, make a significant contribution to restoring public confidence in Government. Public disclosure is the best means of policing avoidable conflicts of interest, and the public, through such disclosure, will be given the facts by which they can make their judgment as to whether the personal holdings of their elected representatives and public leaders have affected, in any way, the performance the public trust assigned to these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade, I have made a voluntary public disclosure of my personal financial affairs and, today, I am continuing that policy. In addition to the report on my financial situation for the calendar year 1974, I also am listing the amount of income taxes I have paid to the Federal Government and the State of Wisconsin for the 1974 calendar year and the sum paid in real estate taxes.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION,
DECEMBER 31, 1974

Cash account with the Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives	\$304.77
Cash	16.78
Securities:	
Marriott Corp. 10 shares	67.50
Loisel Corp. 200 shares	212.50
Horizon Corp. 100 shares	175.00
Bannister Corp. 100 shares	425.00
Solltron 100 shares	87.50
Residential real estate: House, Arlington, Virginia (assessment increased 1974)	*82,400.00
Less Mortgage	33,188.75
Equity	49,211.25
House, Sun Prairie, Wis.	29,000.00
Plus improvements	1,766.00
Lot	1,200.00
Total	31,966.00
Less first mortgage	18,290.72
Less second mortgage	4,500.00
Total	23,290.72
Equity	8,675.28

Household goods and miscellaneous personality	7,000.00
Miscellaneous assets, deposits with U.S. Civil Service retirement fund through December 31, 1974, available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations	38,860.07
Cash surrender, value of life insurance—On the life of Robert W. Kastenmeier	None
On the life of Dorothy C. Kastenmeier	544.00
Donaldson Run Deposit	400.00
Automobiles:	
1963 Oldsmobile	75.00
1966 Ambassador	250.00
1973 Ford LTD	2,400.00
Total Assets	*108,704.65

*\$12,750.00 of increased assets due to an unappreciated, resented, outrageous upward reassessment of my Arlington home.

Liabilities including loan (2)

notes:

National Bank of Washington	1,600.00
Net Assets	107,104.65

Income for Calendar year 1974, excluding congressional salary and expenses:

Honorarium	300.00
Total	300.00
1974 Federal income tax	7,290.40
1974 Wisconsin state income tax	2,869.60
1973 Real estate taxes, Town of Sun Prairie	557.57
1973 Real estate taxes, City of Sun Prairie	29.99
1974 Real estate taxes, Arlington County, Va.	1,325.48
1974 taxes paid	13,083.04

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LLOYD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. LLOYD of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONGRESSMAN MIKE MCCORMACK
DELIVERS SCHMITT LECTURE AT
NOTRE DAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week our distinguished colleague from Washington, Congressman Mike McCormack, delivered the annual Arthur J. Schmitt "Challenges in Science" lecture at the University of Notre Dame in my congressional district.

The Schmitt challenges in science meetings are sponsored by the Arthur J. Schmitt Foundation of Chicago and are designed to provide for the students and faculty of the university an opportunity to hear firsthand reports from leaders in science today and to learn from them the challenges that confront scientists in their efforts to add to the store of knowledge and to contribute to the welfare of mankind.

Presentations have been given by some of the most distinguished scientists of our time, including Linus Pauling, Edward Teller, George Beadle, Willard Libby, James Watson, Arthur C. Clarke, Luis Alvarez, and Edgar Mitchell.

Our distinguished colleague Mike McCormack, is a fitting addition to this list and I want to include in the RECORD his remarks as delivered at Notre Dame:

COMMENTS BY CONGRESSMAN MIKE MCCORMACK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, APRIL 14, 1975

Thank you, Dean Waldman. Distinguished guests, students, faculty and staff, ladies and gentlemen.

It is indeed an honor and a privilege for me to be invited here to address you at Notre Dame.

Last month at the Westinghouse Science Talent Search Awards Banquet in Washington, D.C., when Dean Hofman discussed with me the possibility of my visiting you here at South Bend, I readily agreed to attempt to work out a mutually satisfactory date. I am convinced of the importance of having the leaders of this country's college-age group understand the fundamental facts concerning this nation's energy crisis and how important it is to establish national policies and implement realistic programs with respect to them.

Serious as the energy crisis is today, it will be far worse in the near future unless we focus on, understand, and take appropriate action to solve the real problems with which we are dealing.

During recent months, much attention has been drawn to this nation's increasing dependence upon imported oil, and to the hazards associated with that dependence—particularly with respect to our trade balance, our economy and our national security. The Congress and the Administration and many public and private citizens and groups are involved in a debate over what means this country should employ to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

LONG-RANGE ENERGY PROGRAM NEEDED

Our attention to this immediate problem has, unfortunately, distorted our perspective, and is keeping us from giving the proper attention to the more important, long-range problems associated with the energy crisis. There should be a lesson to be learned here, for if we had established a rational long-range national energy policy ten years ago, we would not find ourselves in today's precarious situation.

The Arab oil embargo, along with the confusion and inconvenience it caused, has accomplished what many years of warnings by scientists could not do. It has made most Americans aware of the fact that the energy resources of this nation are not unlimited, and that this nation can no longer control the policies of weaker nations to the end that they will deliver their resources to us to our advantage and to their disadvantage. It has made Americans aware of how much we depend on a prodigious consumption of energy for our standard of living. It has made us aware of the impact on our economy of the cost of petroleum. When it was cheap, we didn't generally appreciate the all-pervading presence of petroleum in our transportation, central heating and electric generation, or in our food, shoes, clothing, medicine, and much of which we use or touch in our daily lives. Now, as our economy runs amuck and we see the wealth of the Western industrialized nations being rapidly transferred to the oil-exporting nations, we begin to understand. It is essential that our society and our government promptly face up the implications of these new realities, and do so rationally.

April 17, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2939

scribed procedure which included buckling a lap belt and shoulder harness before starting the ignition. The resulting furor from housewives with shopping bags on the passenger seat and drivers faced with the irritation of interlock malfunctions was tremendous. Now we are asking these same people to buy the air bag which is also subject to malfunction.

During the 2 years of air bag use, there have been two so-called inadvertent deployments in the 7,000 air bag-equipped cars on the road. Recurrence of inadvertent deployment when, for some reason the air bag pops out while a person is driving is surely a dangerous condition and one which requires repair of the car and replacement of the air bag. Translated to a 100-million-car population, which is what we will have after 10 years of air bags, the rate of inadvertent deployment becomes more than 20,000 every year.

The air bag question is plagued by substantial doubt about the safety effectiveness, reasonable expectation of public disapproval, and assured inflationary impact. It is, therefore, essential that the House, with the other body concurring, pass a sense of Congress resolution urging the Secretary of Transportation to make a serious and determined effort to work with the leaders of the American automobile industry toward resolving some of the many problems connected with the present passive restraint system. Toward this end, I am introducing a concurrent resolution urging the Secretary of Transportation to use his authority to defer a call for rule-making until such time as passive restraint systems exhibit practicability for introduction into the market. I would like to ask my colleagues in the House to join me in introducing this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PANAMA CANAL GIVEAWAY: CONGRESS OPPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the crucial elements in the current struggle of world power now strikingly evolving is control of the U.S.-owned Canal Zone and Panama Canal. That the people of our country are alert to the situation is evidenced by the fact that since the Kissinger-Tack imbroglio at Panama on February 7, 1974, I have received in the form of letters and petitions as of April 11, 1975, a grand total of 6,950 views from citizens in all of the 50 States that strongly oppose any dilution of U.S. sovereign control over the interoceanic waterway and its protective frame of the Canal Zone and only 11 in support of the State Department giveaway program.

In addition, there have been impressive actions in opposition to the projected surrender by important national organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, the U.S. Industrial Council, and numerous local organizations in various parts of the Nation as well as by State governments.

In the Senate, 37 Senators sponsored Senate Resolution 97 in opposition to any dilution of U.S. sovereign control, and in the House, some 120 Representatives have cosponsored identical resolutions. A recent news story in a California newspaper by Allan C. Brownfeld, a well-informed and able Washington correspondent, summarizes the present status of the Canal Zone sovereignty question. Its conclusion is that the Congress seems ready to make its voice felt in foreign policy in behalf of continued U.S. control over the Panama Canal enterprise.

Because the indicated article by Mr. Brownfeld is both timely and informative, I quote it as part of my remarks:

SOLONS GEAR UP TO FIGHT CANAL GIVEAWAY
(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The Ford Administration is in the process of negotiating a new treaty with Panama that would concede sovereignty over the Panama Canal to the government of that country. The Congress, however, appears ready to reject what many members consider an unwise "surrender." The lines, it seems, are tightly drawn.

Last year, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger signed a declaration of "Eight Principles" with the Panamanians. That paper and subsequent treaty negotiations indicate that a draft treaty now being prepared will contain a plan for the turnover of the canal to Panama as well as an immediate weakening of U.S. jurisdiction over the Canal Zone. Other provisions would include a significant increase in the annual U.S. payment to Panama as well as a fixed date for the total transfer of all authority over the U.S. Canal Zone and the canal itself to Panama. Reports have it that this fixed date has been shortened from an originally planned 15 years in the future to just five years.

The Ford Administration position was recently presented by William D. Rogers, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He declared that the Administration position is to recognize Panama's full sovereignty over all its territory, including the 10-mile wide Canal Zone, while the U.S. would retain effective control over operation of the canal and its defense for a reasonably protracted—but unspecified—period.

This treaty is stirring up serious debate in the Congress and a resolution, sponsored by Senators Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) and John McClellan (D-Ark.), has been submitted calling on the U.S. Government not to transfer any of its rights over the canal and the Canal Zone.

The Thurmond-McClellan resolution has already obtained 37 co-sponsors and under U.S. Senate rules, 67 votes are required for ratification of a treaty. Thus, the resolution exceeds by three names the 34 votes necessary to block the treaty. Supporters of the resolution believe that other Senators can be expected to join the list.

A similar resolution has been offered in the House by Reps. Lenore Sullivan (D-Mo.) and Daniel Flood (D-Pa.), and has been accompanied by 111 signatures.

Under normal circumstances, the House has no voice in treaties with other countries, but the House must approve any transfer of

property acquired with the taxpayers' money, as was the case with the Panama Canal. In the House, a bare majority is sufficient to defeat such a transfer.

The Thurmond-McClellan resolution declares that the U.S. should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the canal and the zone and should "in no way cede, dilute, negotiate or transfer any of the sovereign rights, powers, authority, jurisdiction, or property" there.

Opposing the proposed treaty on the floor of the Congress, Rep. Philip Crane (R-Ill.) declared that, "For the last 60 years the Panama Canal has been a vital link in the military and economic lifeline of the U.S. Moreover, in contrast to its Suez counterpart, the Panama Canal has remained open not just to U.S. ships but the ships of many nations . . . Contrary to what many people believe, the Panamanians have no claim, legal or otherwise, over the Canal or the Canal Zone. Our sovereign rights 'in perpetuity' are clearly spelled out in the Hay-Bunau-Varilla and the Thomson-Urrutia Treaties, our money and know-how were responsible for the Canal being built, and the annual payment we make to Panama is not 'rent' . . . but is an annuity payment . . . since 1903 we have poured almost \$7 billion into the construction, operation, and defense of the Canal."

Congressional opponents of the proposed treaty point out that the benefits to Panamanians of the current arrangement have been considerable: 30 per cent of their foreign exchange earnings and 13 per cent of their total GNP may be directly or indirectly attributed to the existence of the Canal. About one third of Panama's population lives near the Canal Zone, many work in the zone, and it is argued that they would be the biggest losers if the Canal Zone were to be closed as a result of either a national or international power struggle.

Those who urge continued U.S. sovereignty argue that the national interest demands it. Rep. Daniel Flood recently declared that, "Historically, the Caribbean has always been a focal point of conflict because its location is strategic. Today, Soviet power controls Cuba, Soviet submarines prowling regularly in nearby waters, and a long-time Soviet objective is directed toward wresting control of the Panama Canal from the U.S. . . . we ought to learn from the experience of the Suez Canal that following the withdrawal of British troops from the canal zone there it did not take Egypt long to nationalize and expropriate that key waterway. . . ."

Rep. William L. Dickinson (R-Alabama) notes that, "There has been 13 changes of government in Panama since World War II and 5 of them were of a violent nature. In fact, the current leader, General Omar Torrijos, came to power as a result of a coup staged just a few weeks after an elected President took office."

It seems unlikely that the Senate will approve the Ford Administration's proposed treaty. Senator James Buckley (R-C.N.Y.) states that "The Secretary of State ought to have learned by now the virtue of testing senatorial waters before attempting to negotiate away what he cannot deliver . . ." Once again, the Congress seems ready to make its voice felt in the foreign affairs field—this time in behalf of continued U.S. control of the Panama Canal.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the restoration of integrity to Government is

*file on
financial disclosure log.*